

## **REMARKS**

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed July 28, 2004. Claims 1-15 are presently pending in the application.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefanik (U.S. Patent No. 4,004,388) in view of Ehrlich et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,622,115) or Miller et al (U.S. 2004/0062934). For the following reasons this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, it will be noted that the independent claims have been amended to more positively recite that the first and second transparent layers of material are arranged to overlap with portions of the layers of material comprising the skin of the structure in which the window is being secured. This allows the window to be formed as an integral portion of the structure. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the first and second transparent fiberglass layers have edge portions that are arranged to overlap with portions of said skin such that said window forms an integral structural portion of said skin. Independent claim 6 has been similarly amended to recite: the first and second overlap said outer and inner layers to form transparent layers an integral portion of said skin.

Such structure is not shown or suggested by Stefanik. Stefanik is directed to a window panel construction in which an outer sheet 14 and an inner sheet 15, both made of rigid transparent material such as semi-tempered glass, which are separated by inter-layer 16, are bonded to fiberglass strips 25-28. The fiberglass strips are then secured via a threaded screw 46 and nut 47 to an edge attachment member 11 that surrounds

the transparent portion 13 of the window assembly. The edge attachment member 11 is necessary for securing the transparent portion of the window directly to the structural edge flange 35 of the fuselage (Figure 3).

This is fundamentally different from the present invention, which does not require the edge attachment member 11 whatsoever. Instead, the transparent layers that comprise the transparent portion of the window itself are directly secured to layers of material forming the skin of the mobile platform. There is no intermediate structure that is required for performing this function. Thus, the transparent layers, and the epoxy placed therebetween, form an integral, continuous portion of the skin. In view of this fundamental difference, it is believed it is unnecessary to comment on the Ehrlich et al and Miller et al references.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-15 is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 7, 2004

By:   
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600  
MDE/jo